

## Public Comments

### Green River, UT, January 21, 2003

- PC 1      Ten inches rainfall/year – that's never going to get through the pile. What is your concern with the ground water? What is the concern with ammonia on fish?
- PC 2      If fish weren't endangered, would you move the pile?
- PC 3      Is there 200 acres at ECDC?
- PC 4      You might uncover some barrels you don't know about if you move it.
- PC 5      In evaluation of disposal options, what weight does DOE give to co-location or minimizing number of sites? Will that decision come out of the EIS process?
- PC 6      DOE stated that technical information is needed. What value is public input? A lot of dollars are being spent on studies...Do you really want public input?
- PC 7      USF&WS – if they determine EIS is okay (fish not harmed), are you done?
- PC 8      If you capped in place, would you remove the debris?
- PC 9      Can't you move the pile back from the river, prepare a bed liner for it, and leave it in place? I have a problem with just moving the pile from one place to another.
- PC 10     Do you know what debris, building materials, etc., are in the pile?
- PC 11     Dollar wise, what is the cost of cap-in-place, moving, slurring to WMM? What is most expensive, what is least?

**Moab, UT, January 22, 2003**

- PC 12      Jobs – will we know in advance the types and training required? Will preference be given to locals?
- PC 13      In the Federal Register note the need for comments on 10 CFR 1022; add regulation to web site.
- PC 14      Surprised comments are not being recorded.
- PC 15      Need reading rooms in White Mesa, Green River, Blanding, and East Carbon.
- PC 16      EIS – list all applicable local, state, etc. regulations for each remediation plan.
- PC 17      Many links on DOE web site don't work. Even link for this meeting was broken.
- PC 18      February 14 deadline – extend it?
- PC 19      NRC – are they still involved?
- PC 20      Contamination in river – is that from the tailings migrating?
- PC 21      Concerned about alpha and beta blowing off the pile.
- PC 22      What was the original reason for ponding? Why is contouring set up so it collects water instead of shed it off the sides?
- PC 23      Moab Wash goes around pile – is there an underground aquifer moving through the pile? Is fresh water the only recharge to the pile?
- PC 24      Have you done a lot of boreholes and conducted geological studies?
- PC 25      Lives on Ute Reservation – we are against moving it near White Mesa. People are sick. Animals are getting sick. Their ancestors are buried there. You are hurting Mother Earth. There is not enough water.
- PC 26      When the breeze and pollution go south, we breathe it. There's an odor. We don't like too close to our reservation.
- PC 27      They are ruining our herbs.
- PC 28      How are we supposed to eat and drink this? Too much chlorine in our water.

- PC 29      Some of the issues are missed by the note takers. I want to insist that DOE transcribe the meetings tomorrow. There is no way to go back and check to ensure all comments have been captured.
- PC 30      Tailings need to be moved away from the river. Eliminate the no action alternative. Eliminate White Mesa as alternative site.
- PC 31      Doesn't have to be court reporter, could be a tape recorder.
- PC 32      Wrote letter to Assistant Secretary of EM-1. Need to use a court reporter. We are not above the law.
- PC 33      Should have translators. Should be an *On-The-Record* meeting. Testimony needs to be accurately transcribed.
- PC 34      You don't have the info you should have in Grand County or on web site.
- PC 35      UMTRCA Sections 111 and 112 say you have mutual responsibility to keep people in vicinity informed.
- PC 36      Support the local libraries financially.
- PC 37      UDEQ's recommendation is to move pile:  
PC 38      Complication with current/future river migration.  
PC 39      Local river water quality improved if source is removed.  
PC 40      Door step of National Park, moving improves value of nearby property.
- PC 41      Concept of cooperating agencies – Grand County has not been asked to be one.
- PC 42      Is Moab site now federal land?
- PC 43      Jurisdiction by ownership one consideration.
- PC 44      Definitely move pile to Klondike. Against White Mesa option.
- PC 45      Asked at PwC meeting are you really going to spend money to move?
- PC 46      We have watched dumping for years (White Mesa). The pile has to be moved. You can't mitigate the 1,000's of gallons that are draining from the pile.
- PC 47      Floyd D. Spence Act – at end it states that DOE shall remediate including ground water and removal of tailings to another location in Utah.

- PC 48 Voice in favor of materials being moved to White Mesa rather than relocate to location where cause another problem. White Mesa site already exists with highest technology. Use material for nuclear uses, remaining material is inert so ship to White Mesa.
- PC 49 NOI – White Mesa option talked mostly about processing, not much on disposal. What's IUC's intention on handling the tailings?
- PC 50 Title I provision – if processed at Title II site, owner responsible for costs of remilling. Miller would pay DOE a percentage of remilling.
- PC 51 Length of time to dewater and settle the pile? If DOE thinks cap-in-place is best alternative, how long before settled?
- PC 52 Tremendous problem with windblown tailings.
- PC 53 Real momentum in moving pile is water flow. The river causes some migration of tailings. Fresh water aquifer, don't really know capping isn't going to stop flow through pile.
- PC 54 There is NRC documentation of barrels, etc. in the pile.
- PC 55 Is any of your characterization data available to the public?
- PC 56 Is it true that with Atlas they were illegally discharging to the river? When did they make it illegal to dump?
- PC 57 Barrels in pile – came to Grand County Council and admitted to dumping in pile.
- PC 58 Will there be an epidemiology study to determine health effects on people from the tailings?
- PC 59 What depth does the brine layer begin? Is there a potential for contamination to move upward in brine as a result of remediation?
- PC 60 Given that river trips to outside bank, pile is on outside bank, on Moab fault, on Moab floodplain, what is being done regarding catastrophic failure, cost, responsibility?
- PC 61 Consider differential settlement of pile due to salt dissolution. Is something that should be considered.

- PC 62 We are here because NRC failed to regulate site. Failed to obtain adequate funds to cap and long-term care. Failed to make ?? lack of competence by agencies.
- PC 63 Documents on web and in library. Reference documents not on web. DOE should add reference documents or provide links to other sites.
- PC 64 Not much info available on your alternatives. Difficult to make scoping comments without having adequate info. Will make further comments as info comes available.
- PC 65 Law needs to be considered: 40 USC Sec. 407 TIT. 33 ...of Navigable Waters- Chapter 9, Sec. 407, (get quote from Sara).
- PC 66 Called hotline to be put on mailing list, was told there was no info and that it was not necessary for attending scoping meeting; other info would be provided.
- PC 67 How are we considering capping if Floyd D. Spence law said to move it...
- PC 68 Will Moab be included in NRC's budget...particularly since DOE has minimal funding? Why doesn't NRC pay?
- PC 69 Understands radiation has been found as far down river as Lake Havasu.
- PC 70 Why don't you make it so the water runs off the pile right now rather than letting the rainwater soak in (recharge)? The way it's working now, you are having to evaporate rain water as well....
- PC 71 Are you mapping the ground water surface/bedrock surface? Do we know if contaminants are going under the river to the Matheson Preserve?
- PC 72 Most people believe the pile should be moved. I question the completeness of info (historical) you have accumulated. Hope you have made a concerted effort to locate pertinent historical info – wells...indicating quick sand. Private wells existed before millsite.
- PC 73 Consider that Grand County be part of the project management of the effort so we can be a participant and oversee things.
- PC 74 Rafting: during high water years, river goes into pile, carries material back downstream. Are worried about contamination on sand bars.
- PC 75 Acid brought onto pile for years, none hauled off. Where did it go? Into river?

- PC 76 A heavy rain will wash face off pile, materials will go into river.
- PC 77 Folks from Lisbon copper mine want you to help them re-open mine.
- PC 78 As NAS has pointed out, waste doesn't change in 1,000 years, best alternative is isolation, not next to river with millions of users downstream...with river migration...in the long-term the tailings will be put back into the environment. Cap-in-place should be removed from the EIS.
- PC 79 Agree with the Utes against WMM.
- PC 80 If tailings are not moved, Grand Canyon Trust will ask a court to interpret F. D. Spence legislation regarding moving tailings.
- PC 81 I don't think there are many people in the community in the nation that don't want the pile moved. If the pile goes into the river, are we going to clean up the river for the Mexicans?
- PC 82 Need more details on WMM and pipeline location.
- PC 83 Interim cover on pile: We have received no info on monitoring and effect on neighbors. Need as soon as possible.
- PC 84 What is coming off the pile, how long will it keep coming off the pile?
- PC 85 If we move the tailings north of Moab, is there any thought of reprocessing?
- PC 86 It is not just co-locating at WMM or ECDC...there are issues such as new impoundments. DOE is not fully giving the public info on complexities of those sites. Need this info before we can provide scoping comments.
- PC 87 Are there barrels in the pile?
- PC 88 PEIS framework – how far along are you?
- PC 89 Just feel the more heads the better. Have a different environmental awareness now. We are combating the idea that rivers are waste dumps and that they carry waste away from us.
- PC 90 AEC was regulating site, then NEPA in 70's – was actually in 70's that ERDA asked owners to stop discharging.
- PC 91 Quit discharging to river in 1976.
- PC 92 Is long-term monitoring a part of the EIS?

- PC 93 If pile is moved to Klondike, for example, does another EIS need to be performed?
- PC 94 Lots of Anglos in this world, but not many of us...rich people...we are not.
- PC 95 Horses, sheep – what if animals get sick? Deer – cancer in animals.
- PC 96 When the wind blows, can smell the odor...some of elderly died of cancer.
- PC 97 DOE failed to mention in presentation that WMM is X miles from the Ute Reservation. This is the closest population. This is a concern.
- PC 98 Need to extend comment period (scoping) two to three weeks. Need to get people more info on alternatives.
- PC 99 DOE is discovering that Kirtland, Sandia, etc. didn't work?
- PC 100 NEPA refers to a decision – maker's document. The public makes decisions also. NEPA says we are going to “informed consent”. When we comment to GJO...we have to acquiesce(sp?).
- PC 101 You should have translators.
- PC 102 You have asked us, based on this ‘dog and pony show’ to make intelligent comments. I take exception.
- PC 103 You have mischaracterized many things in the presentation. One is NRC's regulation of DOE. They regulate more than 40 CFR 192 compliance.
- PC 104 From this moment on, use a court reporter. It does not intimidate, it supports justice.
- PC 105 Three million users of Colorado River water downstream.

### **Blanding, UT Meeting with Navajos, January 23, 2003**

- PC 106     How many of these terrible contaminants have been detected in Lake Mead?
- PC 107     Has anyone proposed making a golf course out of the tailings pile?
- PC 108     Navajos have been living with uranium. Government didn't tell them it was dangerous. We don't want it, it harms vegetation. Traditional healers gather herbs and willows, these will also be contaminated.
- PC 109     Who's going to drive the trucks? Who's going to pay when there's an accident?
- PC 110     Health issues – cancer and asthma.
- PC 111     Wish meeting could have been in Bluff area (or Montezuma Creek) near the Tribe. Difficult for the Navajos to come to the college.
- PC 112     Spring water used as drinking water and livestock and domestic animals.
- PC 113     We are opposed to WMM alternative.
- PC 114     Has anyone been hurt by this pile (documented)?
- PC 115     We've been sold a bill of goods.
- PC 116     Against slurry pipeline – will affect spring water that has been there for years.
- PC 117     This meeting is for Navajos, but why then is it outside the Reservation? If it was in area, more people would be involved. Why is proposed site near White Mesa and Reservation. We're all human. You're hiding this meeting from the rest of the people.
- PC 118     Wants to understand more. Taking a truck driving class and would like to work for company in moving materials, but doesn't know the dangers.
- PC 119     It will bring opportunities and employment, but it's not a natural thing and doesn't need to come here. Keep it up there.
- PC 120     Disagrees with Navajo Nation letter (refusing cooperative agency status).
- PC 121     We're all involved, no matter where it goes.
- PC 122     Navajo Reservation just the other side of White Mesa. We can see the dirty atmosphere that travels with the river. Uranium will travel.



- PC 123 I know the hazards of the material with UMTRA sites now, they monitor, but it's still dangerous. There is also some spiritual involvement, that's why I'm opposed to WM alternative. But Moab pile needs to be dealt with. Radon gas is one of the biggest hazards.
- PC 124 No matter where you move it, radon gas is going to get into the air.
- PC 125 Isn't this what you told us when you took our land (monitoring)?
- PC 126 Don't say you have to make a decision yourself. You should listen to the elders. Do you think we don't stand up for ourselves?
- PC 127 If it's that important to hear what people think, you should be going to every person.
- PC 128 IUC employee – difference between mining then and now. It is monitored now. It is low-grade. Dust – there is always a water wagon manned. Best safety place he has worked. Past – no signs near mine. If they shut WMM down, we'll lose jobs. I am for the Moab pile moving to WMM. (Another person agreed.)
- PC 129 Has worked in mining. Respirators are much better now. Radioactive material is in its infancy. We don't know what it will do to us in future. I don't feel that I'm at risk. Any questions I ask are always answered. There are risks with any job, but my job is at risk now. With measures at WMM, I think this is the safest disposal. Everyone is exposed to elements that naturally exist. We live in the richest mineral belt in the country. I think we can control it here.
- PC 130 Been to a lot of tailings sites. We can't put it back to its natural state. High wind in summer time.
- PC 131 I need my job at WMM, and we can control it.
- PC 132 Does testing at UMTRA sites, covers are very safe. Clay barrier with engineering involved.
- PC 133 DOE should contact employment agency in San Juan County.
- PC 134 Utes are not a big tribe. Young people should think about the elder Utes.
- PC 135 I know it's a good job, but I don't want it close to my Reservation.
- PC 136 WMM is our (Ute) sacred burial ground.

- PC 137 Navajos and Utes are friends.
- PC 138 Here in San Juan they just look over White Mesa.
- PC 139 Hear workers' concerns, hope there can be better work than this poisonous business.
- PC 140 F&WS found contamination further down the river than DOE indicated.
- PC 141 The Moab pile will eventually be moved. Consider long-term effects. There are safer sites.
- PC 142 Don't move tailings to a burial ground.
- PC 143 Some Navajos are boycotting this meeting because it's not being held on the Reservation.
- PC 144 We have some people worried about jobs, some worried about lifestyle. Prepare materials in simple English. A lot of people don't know how to deal with the fears because we don't understand. Need to have common courtesy.
- PC 145 If you're going to reference Section 7 of F&WS Act, you should have it available.
- PC 146 All records should be conveniently available to all affected communities.
- PC 147 We don't have IUC's proposal to comment on.
- PC 148 We as Native Americans, if we put in plan to have tailings on your land, you would be opposed. We don't want it.
- PC 149 Would like documents available through archives (libraries). We have to pull facts ourselves from National Cancer Institute. We then educate our Native Americans.
- PC 150 Another way to get info out is through these people.
- PC 151 Mexican Hat UMTRA site – company that had site left, we played on 'sand pile'. Elderly who lived in that area are no longer living, they died from cancer. Used sand for ceremonies. Material has now been hauled out, covered. Good feeling that something is being done about Moab pile. The WMM is close enough to my home to work there. Difficult to find jobs close by. Can't say if for or against. It is a good thing young people have something like WMM to fall back on. What was the uranium at Moab used for?

- PC 152 I agree with both protecting jobs and lives. Has worked at Moab and WMM. It's how you treat the uranium that makes it safe. Why complain/argue about it, bury it, deal with it. There's more than just uranium in pile, gold, etc. Maybe later it will make me sick.
- PC 153 For those opposed to WMM, they have emotional response and love of land, but Anglos have same feelings. Just because we work at mill and believe in scientific data, doesn't mean we don't have the same love of land. We can process this and other materials safely.
- PC 154 The danger of the material is greatly exaggerated. 1950-1985, not one case of breast cancer in Navajos.
- PC 155 What will happen to WMM after Moab tailings brought there?

### **Evening Meeting at Blanding, UT, January 23, 2003**

- PC 156 We support this slurry (water district) propose leaving slurry in place afterward for farming use in San Juan County. Have water rights in San Juan River. Bluff surrounded by three rivers and can't get water out of any without pumping.
- PC 157 Fears of this material greatly exaggerated.
- PC 158 Hope decisions will be made on sound evidence not emotions.
- PC 159 If concerned about cancer, no data on anyone getting cancer from uranium during the boom in this area.
- PC 160 Ammonia plume – if normal river levels, how far downstream would ammonia levels be to endanger fish?
- PC 161 She was forbidden to sell jewelry on side of road – endangering public.
- PC 162 We're losing our tourists because they won't stop in towns where there is uranium.
- PC 163 It's weird that we're looking at moving contamination near people.
- PC 164 Driving vehicle for moving tailings? Which alternative is easiest to contain the radium?
- PC 165 WMM – We don't know what they're putting in there. Who watches them? Is the dust radioactive?
- PC 166 How dangerous is it if a truck turns over on the highway?
- PC 167 Drainage from WMM goes into San Juan River; clean up one river to pollute another.
- PC 168 There could already be leaks at the WMM.
- PC 169 IUC is open to visitors.
- PC 170 Why don't we concentrate the locations of uranium storage in a place where it's already regulated?
- PC 171 Land is sacred to me.
- PC 172 Air stations surrounding WMM are monitored.

- PC 173     Material coming here will be refined and rendered as clean as possible.
- PC 174     In favor of slurry.
- PC 175     Cost may be expensive, but U.S. benefits and should pick up costs with us.
- PC 176     Twenty-two other sites have been moved and they're talking about capping Moab in place.
- PC 177     If cap, will probably come back years later and try to move.
- PC 178     I would think it's cheaper to build rail line vs. slurry (few miles of spur vs. 85 miles of slurry).
- PC 179     Works at mill, has small children, believes it's safe; worked there while pregnant, children are healthy. Don't blame mill for natural contaminants everywhere.
- PC 180     Would recycled water be pumped back to Moab? Would have to have some make up water.
- PC 181     Would this (construction) be a fixed price contract?
- PC 182     I want to speak for many people. Explain things to Native Americans.
- PC 183     This is the best time to get this project in WM. Would help unemployment.
- PC 184     Father works at mill, she believes IUC is much safer than when grandfather worked in uranium.
- PC 185     Thinks slurry is best alternative, other options have dust concern.
- PC 186     We can learn to understand what is going on, so we can teach others.
- PC 187     IUC will be able to provide jobs if pile is moved here.
- PC 188     I'm a 'uranium baby'. I support this. Traditional Navajo.
- PC 189     Who do you think will pay others (vendors) to keep their businesses going, people working at mill do.
- PC 190     Money brought in will affect Native American communities also.
- PC 191     Chose to move back here. More concerned with two children who don't live with him (live in big city) than the son that does.

- PC 192 We can take care of the Moab tailings.
- PC 193 If you truck it, what is the interval between trucks?
- PC 194 All the trucks would be bad on the roads.
- PC 195 Doesn't want to see the WMM end, but feels it's coming. They think the Native Americans are unfeeling, but we're not.
- PC 196 Doesn't like slurry line, cost high, will take a long time. Will the water be contaminated? Uranium half-life, disposal cell life is 200 to 1000 years.
- PC 197 We need the slurry pipe, uranium very low activity. How many people have been hurt by the tailings pile?
- PC 198 Against moving tailings near Blanding. We have feelings for the land. Sacred feeling for the land. I'm against it!! Movie stars against it. Losing our tourist. We treasure everything.
- PC 199 I've lived here for 16 years. I have a child. It's about big money and moving the tailings to where people are. The issue is health and money. What brings us together is health. Don't move tailings to where people are, it's bad.
- PC 200 Worked at mill for 10 years and Dad worked at uranium mills for years with no health effects. Heavily regulated. Title II site has less potential for negative effects. I support the slurry if tailings have to be moved.
- PC 201 Born here in Blanding. Owned the mill site before the mill owners. Also runs cattle there. The slurry seams incredible, but if you look at the highways and their degradation, the slurry options looks reasonable. Another incentive is to use the contaminated ground water in the slurry pipeline. The highway is already busy, don't put more trucks on the road, too big a risk. My cattle create more dust than the mill.
- PC 202 Thanks for the chance to input. Very dangerous circumstances with low employment. County government will do anything to bring in jobs. What's the current situation at WM? Who's in charge? What is going on? It makes no sense to move the tailings 85 miles. It's ludicrous to recycle the water. The rivers are likely to dry up. Will we just pollute another river after we clean up one river? I'm not too sure. The only reason it's being considered is because of jobs. Cancer already high everywhere. Let's not gamble.
- PC 203 I'm a land use planner here in San Juan. The term NIMBY make people concerned because they haven't learned about the details. Southwest Utah has five of the best National Parks. Concentrate the tailings in one spot. What is the cost to us? The U.S. should pay the cost no matter what. Do it right.

America was founded on the free enterprise system. It can make this work. Do it safely. Win/win. Limit the number of new sites. Consider the slurry.

- PC 204 Work at IUC. All our records publicly available. We keep dust down. I've got kids. I come home clean. My kids play near mill. Slurry will get the tailings to our site is wonderful. Won't have to characterize new sites. We are open, come on down.
- PC 205 Here five months. What the effect of the pipeline on natural/cultural resources?
- PC 206 What if pipe breaks?
- PC 207 I work for the city. I'm familiar with radon and regulations. I'm in favor of the slurry line. Trucks won't work. Pipe is out of sight and out of mind. Capping is impossible. It has to be moved. Radon very prevalent naturally here in San Juan. It's been here forever. Safety will be set by NRC. More rad exposure to person in petro-chemical plant than uranium mill. Bring more clean water is good for all the people.
- PC 208 I'm for the slurry line. Been in Moab for 50 years and lots of tourist there. Maybe the tourist follow the tailings. Come and visit the IUC mill.
- PC 209 I'm on City Council. I truck for a living. I would support bringing to an existing facility. I support the slurry line. Highway very busy in Moab. San Juan County one of the poorest in the country. Tailings will bring jobs. The city supports the slurry if it needs to be moved. Come and see the mill.
- PC 210 Truck vs. Slurry vs. Rail – I think the rail option would be the cheapest option. A lot of people don't think uranium is dangerous, but it scares me. I live in Bluff. I'm dependent on tourist. Don't drive people away. Are the records at IUC really open to the public. I plan on living here for a long time. If there is a spill, it eventually gets to Bluff.
- PC 211 I've built five uranium piles. I've worked at Monticello. I think the pile will be moved irregardless of science. I've dug deep trenches in the Moab pile. The slimes are tough to deal with. No one has ever moved such a big pile. Monticello cost \$240 million to remediate. The Moab mill is 11 times bigger. Maybe more than \$2B in cost. It's a bad time to get into pile and move. Seventy-five percent of pile already recontoured. The slurry proposal has potential. If you do what we did at Monticello, the hole at Moab will be 60 ft deep. Use good science and write Senator Hatch.
- PC 212 I'm living in Blanding. The mill is okay. More people have been hurt by automobiles and alcohol than tailings. I'm for the slurry. Put is all in one spot.

- PC 213     How much has to be trucked. 200,000 tons of material has to be trucked.  
How much water is required?
- PC 214     I worked at Monticello. DOE runs a safe operation. It should come to  
Blanding.
- PC 215     I am learning to drive a truck. I want to learn more to help my people. I don't  
want this stuff. We are hurting. No jobs. We haul wood to heat. We haul  
water. No electricity.
- PC 216     I'm from Blanding. I'm for the slurry. I'm not contaminated. My kids are  
fine. IUC emphasizes safety.
- PC 217     Now I know how Custer felt. IUC is safe. I like my job. I'm for the slurry.
- PC 218     I live here by choice.
- PC 219     The mill has high standards. I worked at Moab mill for seven years, then  
IUC. My people suffered in the past, but now more safety. One site for all  
tailings.



**White Mesa, UT, January 23, 2003**

- PC 220     Serious hazardous material in the community. How dangerous are the chemicals to the people? Have not heard of anything. Have been to the mill. Dangerous parts are not told. It is bad.
- PC 221     If program coming to affect tribe, Executive Order requires agency to work with Tribal Council. Has not happened.
- PC 222     What is guarantee that WMM will not harm the water wells down the road? The ponds at the mill do not look right. Fencing is inadequate to keep small animals out. Animals have access. If there is a guarantee, then it is up to the Tribal Council to okay or not. Thinks it will happen irregardless of public comments.
- PC 223     Tribe passed resolution against tailings to WMM.
- PC 224     NAS report. Does cost/benefit address tribal cultural/historic resources? Will add funds.
- PC 225     Environmental Justice – what’s good for Moab is at expense of tribal community. Air, water, soil, traditional plant use impacts? Will EIS address impacts to those?
- PC 226     In drought, would water from Recapture Reservoir be available? Would be available from deep water wells? Could threaten economic development of Tribe.
- PC 227     Need to follow executive order to go to the tribe.
- PC 228     Twelve-inch pipeline proposed means mill production here will get bigger.
- PC 229     People’s water supply here comes from a well.
- PC 230     What is brought in by truck?
- PC 231     Ninety-percent of time, bad parts of programs proposed at public meetings is not brought up and most of the program, including this one, seems pre-planned.
- PC 232     Some of these agencies don’t understand where the tribe is at, but we do have muscle back at Washington.
- PC 233     NOI – preliminary investigations of contaminants.

- PC 234 The generic EIS done for building of mill doesn't address processing of these materials. Utes would like to see this.
- PC 235 Existing EIS doesn't accurately address operations of IUC mill.
- PC 236 Trust responsibility – BIA should have been involved; no one here today from BIA.
- PC 237 Water – White Mesa community relies on Navajo aquifer. Water sources are (1) Colorado River, (2) Recaptured Reservoir water – would it be available? and (3) Navajo aquifer.
- PC 238 Have any studies regarding waste sitting along river down river from Moab?
- PC 239 What do other communities have to say about disposal?
- PC 240 Ponds are supposed to be capped at the WMM.
- PC 241 Blanding is running short on water, their solution may impact water source for White Mesa, water is an issue.
- PC 242 We have to take care of what we've got; this is your life and your kids, etc.
- PC 243 Why is White Mesa listed on the bottom of five off-site choices?
- PC 244 We need more information.
- PC 245 Hope at future meetings, you bring a recorder.
- PC 246 Would like to exclude White Mesa as a site.
- PC 247 Other sites have railroad lines to them, so should consider those sites.
- PC 248 Difficult for us to explain to our elders what is being proposed.
- PC 249 We don't know if the health problems of the elders has to do with the WMM.
- PC 250 Economic impact – jobs created and eliminated. He has trading post in Bluff; payoff on ability to handle tourists.
- PC 251 NRC been enormously uncooperative with answering any questions. Real lack of credibility in dealing with federal agencies.
- PC 252 Health issues are clearly the most important. NRC cut off health department's questions regarding health.

- PC 253 How would they feel if we went to their grandmother? Can you stand up and say what you think? I understand Navajo, Ute, and English. Think about the older people. They don't like it. Write it down. We have sheep, deer, and horses, they have cancer, then we eat that deer. Some of our people are now suffering from it. They are hurting our Mother Earth. People from big cities come and like our country, but they're hurting it. The three elders went with Thelma to Moab and they don't like it. They want the younger kids to understand what their elders are saying. This planet is getting bigger and bigger.
- PC 254 Underlying issue is unemployment. WMM does provide jobs, but Navajos have experience in mines and are aware of bomb testing and what it can do.
- PC 255 Navajos are asking DOE to come to their Reservation and explain about the mill tailings and the impacts. Won't have a lot of Navajos who will come to the meeting in Blanding. Many Navajos also don't speak English.
- PC 256 Two issues:
- PC 257 Health: contamination is going to be spread by ground water to the south putting materials downstream where there's population is not a good solution.
- PC 258 Creativity: when is federal government going to do a creative act? Think about good energy uses (e.g., fuel cells)?
- PC 259 Several years ago we combated same problem within the Blanding area. Seems to be same problem recurring. Choice between health and employment, which would you choose?
- PC 260 Instead of these projects coming to our area, have federal government create other opportunities for employment, subsidies.
- PC 261 I'm totally against the waste in Moab, send it back to Washington.
- PC 262 There are safety techniques now major part of the Navajo Nation. Works at the WMM.
- PC 263 Education is now very poor.
- PC 264 Tribal council has a lot to say. It would be nice to see them here at these meetings.
- PC 265 Elders pick berries, etc. That is important.
- PC 266 Asked son if safety training is stressed, required at work (WMM). Yes.

- PC 267 Overseas and in other parts of U.S., they talk about chemicals, etc. How do you get away from it?
- PC 268 The company respects your opinion, we have a representative on the White Mesa board and are joining the council.
- PC 269 These issues seem to go to the same as we discussed several years ago. We are tied to your tradition and culture.
- PC 270 This is a waste nobody wants. No matter where it ends up, its going to impact everyone in the surrounding area.
- PC 271 Navajos are impacted by oil wells as well.
- PC 272 Think all should be off-site alternatives.
- PC 273 People in Moab are concerned about White Mesa. Very little info available about the WMM proposal. IUC has an eight-page report, but it's not available on DOE website.
- PC 274 DOE didn't look at mineral content of tailings that IUC could reprocess. IUC doesn't want to do anything they won't be paid for. EIS should consider cumulative effects of (all activities) relocating to WMM.
- PC 275 I think everybody wants the pile moved. DOE has not properly notified the community of the WMM alternative. White Mesa is closest to affected community, not Blanding as stated in the NOI.
- PC 276 White Mesa community has been overlooked, including the need for jobs.
- PC 277 DOE must comply with Executive Orders on Tribal trust and environmental justice threat to herbs/plants and subsistence hurting. Pipelines must study every inch to see what would be damaged. Agree must listen to elders. Need to inform people of everything that's in the pile. Urge DOE to drop the White Mesa proposal.
- PC 278 What's missing is translation of what elders said today. Need to fully inform White Mesa people, and put reading room in White Mesa. Handouts need to also be in Ute.
- PC 279 WMM will eventually be closed.
- PC 280 Ground water is a critical issue. A full study needs to be done. Atlas wells were not deep enough. There are lots of mills and tailings sites in southeast Utah. DOE needs to consider these. Need to remove WMM as an alternative.

- PC 281 Travels to SLC to NRC meetings to fight WMM. Don't know what you've been telling employees at WMM about what's in Moab pile. NRC did overlook White Mesa, only mentioned Bluff. Our population is only 500 or less.
- PC 282 WMM – have studies been done of contamination? What do other communities think of disposal alternatives?
- PC 283 Water quality, air quality concerns as a community. Community needs to understand the uranium mill process. I have to look at the issue two ways – employment and welfare of community.
- PC 284 WMM – wind plays large role with radioactive materials. Is an 'invisible bullet'. We need more information.
- PC 285 Do use many plants that grow here, the fencing on WMM ponds is bad, no capping. Do use animals also.
- PC 286 If slurry where does water come from? We don't have much.
- PC 287 There are other sites you could look at – we have no rail system.
- PC 288 Why not move it elsewhere than here, you are helping the Moab community get rid of it, but not us. We use natural resources very differently than other communities. Plant/animal use is very different here.
- PC 289 It seems you are focusing very much on the WMM.
- PC 290 In future planning, present financial costs of alternatives. WMM is owned by a Canadian Corp. that does not care about community. Concern that corporation will just go bankrupt and leave problem for federal government to clean up.
- PC 291 Tourists come here because of beauty, not because of dump site. How many people will we lose coming here?
- PC 292 Need to come 'clean'. What is your proposal, your plan? What are the broad impacts?
- PC 293 Have to think about your children, babies, the elderly. Ask questions of elders, write the answers down so you have it.
- PC 294 We are getting sick – the older people – young people may say – “but the job is good money” – but... We live in a dry country. We need water. We have to pay to get water in Blanding. If we go, we will never come back. Our bodies

are important. Few elderly left in White Mesa. We do not want it (tailings) near the Reservation.

PC 295 *Some comments in native tongue – not translated.*

PC 296 It is dangerous to live in this world, but we have to drink our water. I do not have all schooling, but am thankful to you white people for coming here.

PC 297 *Comments by three elders in native tongue, not translated. Annie tried to translate:*

- a. Disagree with WMM, all aspects. Will ruin health, plants, etc.  
Want young people to ask questions of elders, try to learn.

PC 298 Concern with Ute hearing and Navajo hearing. Why is hearing not on Reservation? Meeting in Blanding is not the same – 20 miles.

PC 299 Navajos have much experience with uranium mining, atomic bomb testing – understand what can do to people – many people dying from cancer. Come to Reservation, talk to us. Has science changed?

PC 300 Navajos go to Bluff for drinking water. Is there any seepage of contamination into the water? Will we get cancer?

PC 301 Employee of IUC (WMM) – many rules, regulations, we take to assure waste is taken care of properly. If I did not have this job I would have to move elsewhere to support family. We have to make choices.

PC 302 Placing material near population with water heading toward it is not right.

PC 303 Many proposals for dump sites here in past years. Government looks to near term solutions, not long term.

PC 304 Think about alternative energy. Bring research facility here – fuel cells for example. Think about creating jobs by bring energy research here.

PC 305 Unemployment is high, but have to weigh disease vs. employment. Which would you want?

PC 306 If material is brought here, will continue to glow for years and years to come.

PC 307 Materials go to Lake Powell. Already very contaminated – mercury – will be very expensive to treat to make it potable.

PC 308 Don't bring projects here that will just 'do away' with human beings. Send waste back to Washington to Bush Administration.

- PC 309 Father worked in uranium mines to support family. Healthy lives or employment. This is not easy. Son and son-in-law work at WMM, it's the only work they can get. I am here today because my dad took choice to work in mines.
- PC 310 We have numerous power plants on Navajo Reservoir. Electricity can be dangerous, but people have work there. I know education is important.
- PC 311 This all based on making choices. We all have to make choices.
- PC 312 Just want people to understand my point of view also. If safety is required and followed, I don't really have a problem with it. We live in a world that the issues may be here or across the country and can still affect us. We all have to make choices.
- PC 313 Many emotions regarding WMM this is not the place for me to discuss. DOE will do that. IUC is open to meeting with Utes at any time and look forward to doing so. I have learned things today.
- PC 314 Sacred burial sites – those should not be tampered with.
- PC 315 This is a waste no one else wants. It will affect all of us one way or another. The NOI does not speak to any benefit to Native Americans. If there is benefit, then we can debate.
- PC 316 Can smell the chemicals they use at WMM. How many people are affected?
- PC 317 We do not want it, and don't need it.
- PC 318 Opposed to capping in place. Most community agrees. Do not want it sent to WMM though.
- PC 319 Need more info from DOE on WMM alternative.
- PC 320 My org works with Native Americans on health issues of projects affecting them. I have been asked by Tribal Counsel to be here.
- PC 321 Concerned Native Americans may not be aware of the WMM proposal because we were not adequately made aware. DOE needs this input.
- PC 322 Need to eliminate WMM because DOE has trust responsibility with tribes – cannot (comply) if you put tailings at WMM.
- PC 323 I challenge IUC to respect the Elders. Will also follow up to assure DOE complies with laws. Drop WMM alternative now.

- PC 324 At Moab, ground water studies were not acceptable.
- PC 325 Consider added funds to clean up WMM if you add materials here.
- PC 326 EIS should consider cumulative effects of all uranium mills in SE Utah. Maybe put all tailings in one place.
- PC 327 Need to consider White Mesa community in documents.
- PC 328 Have been fighting this for a long time (WMM). Wrote thousands of letters to NRC – no response. NRC/DOE were asked not to bring atomic waste to WMM.
- PC 329 Trucks bring in atomic bombs being cleaned up from Tijuana (Tonawanda). You don't explain WMM as anything more than a mill.
- PC 330 NRC ignored Ute Reservation two miles from WMM – only looked at Blanding.



PC 331 Info gathered for EIS, publish in readily available areas. We need to read the material.

PC 332 My husband and I are for it. My husband worked in Washington, D.C. with anthrax which is much more dangerous.

**East Carbon, UT, January 28, 2003**

- PC 333     What notice was posted for meeting?
- PC 334     Does ECDC sit on Mancos shale?
- PC 335     If ECDC, will it open them up to store any nuclear material of that type?
- PC 336     Wells in ground water – what are airborne products?
- PC 337     What will off-gas from evaporation ponds.
- PC 338     Forty-five day comment period? Will you notify by newspaper?
- PC 339     How do you know you can design a pond to last 200 to 1,000 years?
- PC 340     List of cooperative agencies and contacts.
- PC 341     Wants to review NAS comments.
- PC 342     DOE relies on interested (ECDC) sites for data – will DOE collect their own? Advises caution in using others parties' data.
- PC 343     How will DOE do LTSM at these sites and assure other Title II sites don't become Title I sites?
- PC 344     Include homeland security issues in EIS.
- PC 345     Federal/State lands – will DOE own land or enter into 'use' agreements with agencies?
- PC 346     To Representative Cannon: DOE has funding shortfall, what is position?
- PC 347     What do you do to make cells safe? To guarantee no more drainage; what will moving it here do to the health of our community; does it have to be so close to town?
- PC 348     Opposed to ECDC when they came in. Don't think waste is currently monitored well. Wants DOE to monitor them. Businesses will cut costs to save money.
- PC 349     Any consideration given to moving tailings to LaSalle area – old mines, etc?
- PC 350     Why must move from Moab? Why can't it remain there?

- PC 351 Not too worried about uranium – has worked with it entire life, but... milling with acid makes it very easy to mobilize – the dust from this will have to be taken care of very carefully.
- PC 352 Have water shortage in the East Carbon area.
- PC 353 What is the plan for cell design if pile is left in place?
- PC 354 How many tons of tailings would be moved?
- PC 355 Own guest ranch in Moab area – conduct river and pack trips – Sierra Club member – all of us in Moab are in support of moving the tailings – Colorado River is polluted from Moab site and other sources.
- PC 356 Sierra Club (Glen Canyon Group) resolutions:
- PC 357 No new waste to White Mesa Mill
- PC 358 Epidemiological study for White Mesa Mill.
- PC 359 EIS previously done for WMM was inadequate, did not adequately consider Utes in spite of close proximity. Also Navajos, please consider them in EIS. They placed WMM on burial sites. Need to consider in EIS. No one has forced WMM to do another EIS although new wastes are coming in. Any costs should be borne by IUC.
- PC 360 Is interesting that Moab/Sierra Club don't want this. If moved here, it eventually gets to Colorado River then Lake Powell, etc.
- PC 361 Enviros should come see East Carbon on a windy day to see dust from ash dump. We have little water.
- PC 362 Also member of Sierra Club. I'm here to hear East Carbon people's thoughts on this proposal. Moab does not support moving pile where people don't want it.
- PC 363 By time decision is made, State of Utah would have license responsibility rather than NRC. Would the pile be covered or would it be left open to accept other uranium mill tailings? (Plateau site by Lake Powell.) Would it become another Envirocare?
- PC 364 DOE eventually takes site back after remediation complete for long-term. How would ECDC land be transferred back to DOE?
- PC 365 Please talk about long-term radiological hazards. Discuss length of time those tailings will remain hazardous to the environment.

- PC 366 Would the long-term monitoring DOE does also apply to ECDC?
- PC 367 Former citizen representative supporting initiative to bring ECDC. Involved with hearing on incinerator in Tooele. We felt waste to Tooele was good for community. Promise that no hazardous waste could come to ECDC. Against radiological waste so close to town.
- PC 368 To put waste here, prevailing winds are a problem. This is not a good, safe location. If not so close to town and different wind direction, would support it.
- PC 369 What is happening with coal dust/ECDC when we have 85 mph winds. Why is this okay?
- PC 370 Am concerned it brought to ECDC, how far from highway would waste be located? In separate cells?
- PC 371 Cattle graze behind ECDC. Would that eliminate grazing?
- PC 372 How far south does ECDC land go?
- PC 373 My first concern is health and welfare of community. I work there and I would be first to call State Air if it's a problem. Household waste is worst waste you will find. No regulations. Hazardous/industrial is regulated and monitored. Property is owned by Allied Waste.
- PC 374 Has anyone noticed the dirt/dead vegetation near ECDC site? Hasn't been in operation long. What would new DOE waste do? What would it do to local property values? There was a promise not to bring in hazardous waste.
- PC 375 Why is DOE considering ECDC at all?
- PC 376 Sierra Club, Colorado River Guides, Living Rivers, Water Keepers Alliance. Pile should be moved. Geologic/hydrologic issues, but also laws, Endangered Species Act, CWA, etc. requiring it. We feel waste should remain in Grand County only to little impact sites of Klondike or Crescent. Opposed to slurry – too much electricity, too much water usage – not wise choice.
- PC 377 Regardless of where tailings go, what happens if tailings pile leaks?
- PC 378 I'd prefer it be located under DOE's responsibility, not to a privately-owned site. Also, to where it is unpopulated.
- PC 379 Consider in-situ soil stabilization. Would be costly, but would be more stable form of uranium. Also, some new chemical techniques for stabilization.

- PC 380 All communities should join together to keep waste away from communities. Can communities join together as a cooperating agency under NEPA to have representatives involved with DOE in the EIS process?
- PC 381 CERCLA has community involvement funds (Superfunds); is there something that could be done here?
- PC 382 Why do we need to build hazardous waste sites near people? Also, not near rivers, rivers move. Also, want tailings where DOE would be responsible, not a business for profit running it.
- PC 383 Who will make the ultimate decision and when? How will decision be made?
- PC 384 Any opposition to Crescent Junction and Klondike Flats?
- PC 385 What is cheapest option for moving it or disposing of it?
- PC 386 Urge everyone to go do the GJO web site. Some documents are there, also the Moab library has documents. Recommend all local libraries have documents. Law says DOE must make info conveniently available for public.